

REMARKS

Claims 14, 22 and 24-30 have been canceled. Claims 1, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-13, 15-21 and 23 remain in the application. No new matter is being added. Support for the amendment to the claims can be found in the specification and drawings. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14, 15, 22 and 23 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Allowability of the subject matter of claims 14, 15, 22 and 23 is noted with appreciation.

By this amendment, in lieu of rewriting claim 14, the limitations of claim 14 have been incorporated into independent claim 1, from which claim 14 originally depended. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is in prima facie condition for allowance.

Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 is in prima facie condition for allowance.

In lieu of rewriting claim 22, the limitations of claim 22 have been incorporated into independent claim 16, from which claim 22 originally depended. Accordingly, independent claim 16 is in prima facie condition for allowance.

Claim 23 depends from allowable claim 16 and remains as originally filed. Accordingly, claim 23 is in prima facie condition for allowance.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DePetrillo (U.S. Patent 6,342,400) in view of Nishimura (U.S. Patent 5,761,337). With respect to claim 24-30, the same have been canceled herein by this amendment, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot. With respect to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 21, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. As noted herein, claim 1 is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, i.e., it has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 14 (now canceled).

Claim 1 is thus in prima facie condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 21 depend from and further limit independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable as well.

Further as noted herein, claim 16 is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, i.e., it has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 22 (now canceled). Dependent claims 17, 19, 20 and 21 depend from and further limit independent claim 16, and therefore are allowable as well.

Claims 3 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DePetrillo (U.S. Patent 6,342,400) in view of Nishimura (U.S. Patent 5,761,337) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Forest (U.S. Patent 2,806,959). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. Dependent claim 3 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well. Dependent claim 18 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 16 and therefore is allowable as well.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DePetrillo ('400) in view of Nishimura ('337) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Ruben (U.S. Patent 6,781,232) and Forest ('959). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. Dependent claim 9 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well.

Conclusion

No amendment made herein is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Further, no amendment herein is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In addition, the Office Action contains a number of statements characterizing the claims, the Specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements are addressed by Applicant, Applicant refuses to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicant.

The matters identified in the Office Action of October 31, 2006 are now believed resolved. Accordingly, the application is believed to be in proper condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at the number indicated below.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-13, 15-21 and 23 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 34,291

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854